DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 098 SO 032 485

AUTHOR Ogawa, Masato
TITLE Sixth Grade Students' Development of Historical Perspective: World War II and the Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
PUB DATE 2000-11-16
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (80th, San Antonio, TX, November 16-19, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Classroom Research; Empathy; Foreign Countries; Grade 6; *Historical Interpretation; Middle Schools; *Nuclear Weapons; *Perspective Taking; Qualitative Research; Skill Development; Social Studies; Teacher Role; *Teaching Methods; *World War II
IDENTIFIERS Georgia; *Japan (Hiroshima); *Japan (Nagasaki)

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how the use of various teaching methods influenced perspective taking skills of sixth grade middle school students during a unit of instruction on World War II. Three questions directed the study: (1) What do students know about World War II prior to a unit of study on World War II; (2) What do students know about World War II after reading U.S. textbooks and participating in typical classroom activities; and (3) What happens to students' perspective taking skills as they engage in various activities, such as comparative textbook analysis or an oral history activity, related to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in addition to the unit of study on World War II? One teacher and 44 culturally diverse students in two social studies classes in a rural Georgia public school participated in the study. A qualitative case study methodology was employed; qualitative data consisted of interviews, classroom observation and participation, and document analysis. Discusses two students in depth. (Contains 76 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 449 098

Sixth grade students' development of historical perspective: World War II and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki

SO 032 485

Masato Ogawa
621 Aderhold Hall
Department of Social Science Education
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
(706) 542-4135
e-mail: mogawa@coe.uga.edu

Masato Ogawa

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented for the College and University Faculty Assembly
at the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Conference

San Antonio, Texas, November 16, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Introduction

Young students have traditionally characterized history as mundane, difficult, uninteresting, dry, and irrelevant to their present and future lives (Crocco, 1998; Levstik, 1986; Smith & Manly, 1994). Students often have difficulty understanding chronological archival details that become confused, conflated, and eventually forgotten (Crocco, 1998; Levstik, 1986; Smith & Manly, 1994; VanSledright, 1995). In this case, students see history as an isolated period of time and their connection to it is the memorization of facts and dates (Bohan & Davis, 1998; Johnson, 1998; Smith & Manly, 1994; VanSledright, 1995). History, however, need not appear that way. Foster (1999) states, "At its best, the study of history can convey to young learners a sense of wonderment and inquisitiveness. It can encourage students to consider intimately the thoughts and beliefs of people in the past: to understand and appreciate their circumstances, their predicament, their actions: and ultimately, to reflect on those consequences of those actions" (p. 18).

Teachers at elementary and secondary school levels have responsibilities to involve students in historical construction and to allow them to think critically about the past (Foster, 1999; Levstik, 1997). However, the domain modes of instruction continue to be traditional large-group, teacher-dominated, and teacher-controlled recitation and lecture based primarily on the textbook in middle school social studies classrooms, for example (Allen & Stevens, 1998). Teachers in many classrooms tend to use the traditional approach of textbooks as "their major vehicle for instruction" (vonEschenbach & Ragsdale, 1989). The American Textbook Council indicates that teachers rely on a textbook for 70 to 90 percent of their social studies instruction (Cohen, 1995). Teachers continue to use textbooks for the following reasons: curricular organization, instructional efficiency, personal habit, and survival in the face of daunting workloads (Crocco, 1998) and the lack of knowledge. Many researchers point out that the extensive textbook usage is one of the reasons why students often react negatively to learning history (e.g., Crocco, 1995; Downey & Levstik, 1991; Goodlad, 1984; Loewen, 1995).

The National Center for History in the Schools (1994) supported important educational reform in U.S. schools in its suggested national history standards. These standards identified the ability to describe the past "through the eyes and experiences of those who were there" as an essential component of historical comprehension (Barton, 1996). In order to adequately develop this ability, students and teachers must go beyond textbooks (Klages, 1999; Wade, 1993) because, as Levstik (1986) points out, textbook-based teaching and learning practices are largely unsuccessful in developing students' historical understanding and perspective. Many textbook narratives provide scant attention to perspective or empathy because they simply tell sets of "historical facts." These

standards emphasized that the use of diverse methods and materials helps to account students' feelings, emotions, and perspectives of the people who were involved in historical events.

Many educators and researchers, particularly in Britain and the United States, agree that the ability to take the perspective the people in the past, sometimes known as historical empathy, is an important goal in history (e.g., Ashby & Lee, 1987; Barton, 1996; Dickinson & Lee, 1984; Downey, 1995; Foster, 1999; Foster & Yeager, 1998; Levstik & Barton, 1997; Portal, 1987; Seixas, 1995; Shemilt, 1984; Yeager, Foster, Maley, Anderson, & Morris, 1997, 1998). In fact, some significant studies have been conducted of the topic on historical perspective-taking or empathy in both countries; however, the number of the studies is still small (Barton, 1996; Foster, 1998). In addition, small number of the studies have examined what shapes students' historical perspective taking or empathy (e.g., Ashby & Lee, 1987; Barton, 1996; Downey, 1995; Yeager, Foster, Maley, Anderson, & Morris, 1997, 1998).

Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate how the use of various teaching methods influences perspective taking skills of middle school students (sixth grade in this case) during a unit of instruction about World War II. Three research questions directed this study: (1) What do students know about World War II prior to a unit of study on World War II?; (2) What do students know about World War II after reading their U.S. textbooks and participating in typical classroom activities?; and (3) What happens to students' perspective taking skills as they engage in various activities such as comparative textbook analysis and an oral history activity related to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as an addition to the unit of study about World War II?

There are several reasons why World War II and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were selected for this study. First, many teachers use a textbook as a primary source for teaching about World War II (Barth, 1992, 1995). Second, a recent poll conducted by CNN (1999) showed that three historical events related to World War II (Hiroshima, Pearl Harbor, and Holocaust) were picked as the most impressive historical stories of the 20th century. World War II has been a legacy for many people even though over fifty-five years passed. Third, the historical event of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is well situated as one conducive to multiple perspectives. In fact, little consensus exists on the rationale for the atomic bombing or the subsequent effects, implications, and results of the employment of such weaponry, not only between Japan and the United States but also among historians (Bohan & Davis, 1998). Thus, students can learn about varying perspectives and divergent interpretations of an event, and also can learn about the differences between supportable and insupportable claims (Levstik, 1997).

Fourth, the topic has enormous relevance to contemporary issues including the justifiable and moral use of force, the presence of nuclear weapons, and concerns for the environment (Foster & Morris, 1994). Finally, the topic was selected because of my interest in the various perspectives surrounding the event, and the methods and materials used to read about it in the United States and in Japan, my home country. In a prior study, I found that the treatment of Japan's post-World War II events in the major history textbooks in use in the United States and Japan differs greatly (Ogawa, 1998, 1999).

2. Researcher stance

The researcher for this study is a Japanese doctoral student majoring social science education and attending a graduate school in the South. The major content topic in this study, World War II, is a controversial one. My home county is Japan. Consequently, my perspectives about World War II and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki should be noted. In Japan, the legacy of World War II is still part of everyday reality, directly or indirectly influencing national goals and foreign policies (particularly relationships with Asian countries), postwar identity and aspirations, and intergenerational relationships (Hashimoto, 1998). As a Japanese citizen, I think that the Japanese actions during the war should be open to scrutiny, as should the actions of other countries. We no longer repeat the same tragedy again. However, like the majority of Japanese people (Krauss & Hashimoto, 1996), I support the Japanese mainstream view or U. S. revisionist view of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that there are no logical reasons why the United States dropped the atomic bombs on Japan. The events leading up to should be carefully studied. When the atomic bombs were dropped, Japan was ready to surrender. My Japanese perspective was influenced by Japanese parents, Japanese friends, Japanese textbooks, Japanese teachers, books written by Japanese authors, and Japanese media. Although I didn't learn a great deal about World War II and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in social studies and history classrooms, I read some stories of victims of the atomic bombing in moral education and human rights education classrooms. I visited Hiroshima and Nagasaki when I was a middle school and high school student and saw many tragic photos at both cities' peace museums.

As a graduate student studying in the United States, majoring in social science education, and being interested in the teaching and learning of history, I have come to know the American traditionalist view that the United States ended the war and saved both American and Japanese people due to the dropping the atomic bombs. Through reading books and journals, analyzing social studies and history textbooks, watching TV programs, and talking with American students, I understand that many American people

support the traditionalist view of this historical event. In addition, I also understand that international students studying at the same university have different historical views about the war and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. However, at the same time, I have also learned that many people are not interested in the event or do not have sufficient knowledge about the event to make a judgment.

I come to understand both Japanese and American mainstream perspectives about World War II and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. However, I have strong resistance to accept the American mainstream perspective because my Japanese perspective had been constructed by various factors for a long time. I am not able to support the American mainstream perspective because it ignores the fact that many innocent civilians were killed by the atomic bombs although the American mainstream perspective is rational.

Throughout this study, I was mindful that my Japanese perspective might affect my interpretation of the data. Therefore, it is essential that I identify my researcher's biases and assumptions that I bring to the research and allow the reader to be the final judge.

3. Historical perspective taking and empathy

Many educators and researchers, particularly in Britain and the United States, agree that the ability to take the perspective the people in the past, or known as historical empathy, is an important goal in history and an element central to historical reasoning (e.g., Ashby & Lee, 1987; Barton, 1996; Dickinson & Lee, 1984; Downey, 1995; Foster, 1999; Foster & Yeager, 1998; Levstik & Barton, 1997; Portal, 1987; Seixas, 1995; Shemilt, 1984; Yeager, Foster, Maley, Anderson, & Morris, 1997, 1998). However, for many years, scholars and historians have debated the nature and meanings of the terms of historical perspective taking and empathy. While some people use these two terms interchangeably, researchers in Britain have tended to use the term of historical empathy and researchers in North America have commonly used the term of perspective taking (Barton, 1996).

Although historical empathy is an ambiguous term (Boddington, 1980; Knight, 1989), many researchers have defined the nature and meaning of historical empathy. Barton (1996) noted that historical empathy is the skill to recognize how people in the past viewed their circumstances, evaluated their opinions, made decisions, and how their perceptions were shaped by their values, beliefs, and attitudes. Foster (1999) described six fundamental qualities of historical empathy; (1) historical empathy is a process that leads to an understanding and an explanation of why people in the past acted as they did; (2) historical empathy involves an appreciation of historical context and chronology in the

evaluation of past events; (3) historical empathy is reliant upon a through analysis and evaluation of historical evidence; (4) historical empathy involves an appreciation of the consequences of actions prepared in the past; (5) historical empathy demands an intuitive sense of a bygone era and an intuitive recognition that the past is different from the present; and (6) historical empathy requires a respect for an appreciation of sensitivity toward the complexity of human action and achievement.

The term of perspective taking is used as a weak sense of empathy, rather than a more strongly affective kind (Boddington, 1980; Downey, 1995). Lee and Ashby (in press) described that "perspective taking" was cumbersome, and too wide in scope, rather than "empathy" (p. 21). However, as Knight (1989) pointed out, the term of empathy is a source of confusion to classroom teachers, who tend to confuse empathy with sympathy and substitute exhortations to feel and imagine for thinking. To avoid some confusion, the term of perspective taking was used in this study.

Researchers in Britain and North America have examined historical empathy or perspective taking. British researchers, such as Ashby and Lee (1987), have developed systems of classifying students' empathetic understanding. Ashby and Lee provided five levels of empathetic understanding: level 1 (the 'devi' past), level 2 (generalized stereotypes), level 3 (everyday empathy), level 4 (restricted historical empathy), and level 5 (contextual historical empathy). Through their research, they found that students' performances are neither stable nor fixed. They argue that children often reach higher levels of understanding when arguing out a problem among themselves than they would achieve on their own, provided the problem is one they have some strategies for tacking.

However, the present research on historical perspective-taking and empathy in Britain and North America has examined how students made sense of the perspectives of people in the past and how students' thinking developed through, for example, taking the course of the year, analyzing various documents, and reading books, rather than establishing a set of stages of empathetic understanding. Historical empathy or perspective taking has typically received less attention in North America than in Britain; however, many researchers have recently begun to focus attention on this topic.

Downey (1995) examined historical perspective-taking which included a variety of writing activities: role-playing exercises, written critiques of conflicting accounts, the written paraphrases of primary sources, list-making to order events in chronological sequence, summary writing and the writing of an historical narrative. Downey concluded that the narrative-writing task was a more successful perspective-taking exercise than other tasks such as role-playing and letter writing because students had sufficient information and

time to account for the perspective to another with relative ease in order to explain casual relationships.

Barton (1996) examined the ability of fourth and fifth grade students to develop perspective taking skills for people of the past and to avoid the belief that people in the past were no different than today. Interviews with students indicated that they had developed understanding that people in the past had different behaviors and attitudes, and that present perspectives will someday become old-fashioned. Barton pointed to some instructional considerations of historical perspective-taking through analyzing this research. First, students' perspective taking skills were developed and influenced by teachers' instruction. Second, a variety of activities such as group discussions, compositions, role-plays, simulations, and debates developed students' historical perspective taking skills. Finally, attention to perspective-taking should take place within the context of meaningful, interactive activities.

Yeager, Foster, Maley, Anderson, and Morris (1997, 1998) examined high school students' understanding of historical empathy, with a focus on the issue of Trumans' decision to bomb Japan during World War II. Group One read only one high school textbook, while students of Group Two read a variety of sources including a diary written by a Japanese physician, articles from Harry S. Truman's memories, recollections from a prisoner of war, and several excerpts from books and texts. This research found that the students in Group Two were better equipped to view the issue of Truman's decision to bomb Japan at hand in a complex manner and that they found ways incorporate his or her own perspective into their written responses. On the other hand, the members of Group One saw the bomb as an either/or proposition, a simple choice between American and Japanese lives, and they tended to praise Truman for making a tough but necessary decision. The researchers of this study found that the use of various documents, particularly primary documents, developed students' empathy.

4. Procedures

Research site and participants

The study was conducted during a period of three weeks surrounding Memorial Day in 2000. The site of this study is Greenfield Middle School, a public middle school in rural Georgia with an enrollment of approximately 530 students drawn largely from a working class neighborhood. The site selection is convenient based upon my previous study in this school and my professional relationship with the classroom teacher, Ms. Judy Williams (all names are pseudonyms).

Participants in this study were Judy, a female social studies and mathematics teacher with seven years teaching experience (one year in high school and six years in middle school), and her two social studies classes of sixth grade, culturally diverse students (N=44). One class has 22 students: 11 boys (9 Whites and 2 African-Americans) and 11 girls (5 Whites and 6 African-Americans). The second class has 22 students: 13 boys (10 Whites and 3 African-Americans) and 9 girls (7 Whites and 2 African-Americans). Seven case study students were selected by Judy for subsequent interviews by the researcher: 4 boys (3 Whites and 1 African-American) and 3 girls (2 Whites and 1 African-American). These seven students represent different academic performance skills: 2 high average, 4 average, and 1 low academic ability students.

Two oral history narrators, an American and a Japanese World War II veteran, visited the classroom during the unit of study. The American veteran, Mr. Martin, was chosen from the community and volunteered to speak about his experience during World War II and his perspective of the war. The Japanese veteran, Mr. Yamada, who can speak English, was chosen by the researcher and volunteered to speak about his experience during World War II and his perspective of the war. The selection of Mr. Yamada was convenient based upon the researcher's individual relationship with him.

3-week unit of the instruction about World War II

During the first week, students learned about World War II by listening to Judy's lectures, taking notes during her lecture, and reading their textbook and handouts. Students also watched Channel 1 new show that provided some programs about World War II. Students learned about the European Theater and then the Pacific Theater of World War II. Judy taught World War II as be "bloodiest and most costly war in history." During lectures about the European Theater, she used a map to teach which countries involved in the war and how Germany expanded her territories. About the Pacific Theater, she used a concept map to teach about Japan during the war chronologically. All students copied the concept map while listening to Judy's lecture.

Then, students engaged in a comparative textbook analysis. Students compared readings which consisted of treatments of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki from their U.S. textbook used (Prentice Hall's *Geography: Tools and concepts*, 1998) and a translated version from a Japanese textbook (Osaka Shoseki's *Chugaku Shakaika*, 1991). Students completed a data sheet in which they classified similar and different treatments of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in these U.S. and Japanese textbooks. Five key topics for comparison were: (1) Creation of the atomic bomb: "Who made the atomic bomb?" "How was the atomic bomb tested?"; (2) America's motives and

objectives in using the bomb: "Why did the United States drop the atomic bomb?"; (3) Soviet role: "What was the Soviet role in dropping the atomic bomb?"; (4) Dropping of atomic bombs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki: "How do textbooks in the two countries treat the atomic bomb?"; and (5) Aftermath of the bombing: "How many people died or were injured by the atomic bombing?" These five topics were consistent with those from previous studies concerning this historical event by Fleming (1983), Henry (1996), Kazemek (1994), and Siler (1990).

After completing the comparative textbook analysis activity, students learned about the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by listening to Judy's lecture, listening to the Hiroshima victims' stories that she had cited from a web page of Hiroshima City, and reading handouts about the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that she had prepared. She taught about varying perspectives and divergent interpretations of an event, and also taught about the differences between supportable and insupportable claims. In addition, students learned a hypothetical situation in which they imagined Hiroshima was their community and a Hiroshima scaled bomb had been dropped. Maps of Georgia and their county, based upon diagrams originated by Hood (1998), were provided for reference and were put in the classroom during the unit. Students informally talked with Judy and other classmates about the realities of devastation. They wondered what parts of their community would be destroyed and how many people would suffer if a 25-megaton bomb, the same scale of current nuclear weapons, were dropped. At the end of the lecture about the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Judy asked students to write a 5-sentence essay about the historical event.

Next, students participated in oral history activities. To introduce the topic of oral history, Judy used a personal example, that of her youngest son's oral history interview project with her 70-year-old father about his experience during the Korean War. She told her students that this wartime story because she had never heard and she discovered many things about her father through her son's oral history project. Students listened to the story very quietly and with interest.

Next, students prepared interview questions for Mr. Yamada and Mr. Martin. Judy assigned her students to brainstorm questions they would like to ask particular to Mr. Yamada and Mr. Martin and questions they would like to ask both. Some students prepared interview questions with classmates, and other students, particularly high ability students and students who were interested in history, prepared questions individually. After Judy collected students' interview questions she shared some questions with the students and chose 27 questions for Mr. Yamada and Mr. Martin. Judy typed up these

questions for the students to use, making sure to leave enough space under each question to make notes during the interviews.

Then, students engaged in a group oral history interview with Mr. Yamada one day and Mr. Martin the following day. There are three reasons Judy used a group oral history interview process. First, her students could use their time well by interviewing the respondents as a group. Second, by guiding the students through the oral history activity, she helped them understand what oral history is (Weineberg, 1996). Third, all students were able to have equal access to the World War II veterans. During the group interviews, Judy passed out the typed list of questions for each respondent and then students took turns asking their questions. While listening to responses of the Japanese and American veterans, students took notes on their responses and later discussed perceptions related to the questions. Some students asked additional questions of Mr. Yamada, such as what were Japanese women's roles during the war and topics they were interested in, such as Japanese martial arts and food. They asked some additional questions of Mr. Martin about a picture of the battleship to which he was assigned during the war. Through their oral history activities, students learned first hand that the story of history was told in different ways, from different perspectives.

After the group oral history interview, Judy asked her students to answer questions related to the Japanese and American veterans' stories. To complete the reflective writing assignment, students reviewed their questionnaire sheets and notes. They wrote their findings and reflected on their understandings of the multiple perspectives represented by the interview and supported by what they had learned.

Research design

A qualitative case study methodology was employed for this study. There are three reasons why I selected a case study. First, the case study is rational for my study to investigate the purpose and research questions of my study. Second, a case study is a particularly suitable design if the researcher is interested in process. My study focused on the process of how middle school students' historical perspective taking skills are influenced by various teaching methods. Sanders (1981) writes, "Case studies help us to understand processes of events, projects, and programs and to discover context characteristics that will shed light on an issue or project" (p. 44). Third, I used a case study because it plays an important role in advancing a field's knowledge base (in my case, historical thinking, perspective taking, and teaching and learning of history). The nature of case study makes it an appealing design for an applied field of study such as education.

My study has the potential to affect and perhaps even improve practice, and some teachers might use the same or similar procedures when they teach about history.

Data collection

Qualitative data consist of "direct quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, feelings, and knowledge" obtained through interviews; "detailed descriptions of people's activities, behaviors, actions" recorded in observations; and "excerpts, quotations, or entire passages" extracted from various types of documents (Patton, 1990). For my study, I used three principle data sources: interviews with the classroom teacher and seven case study students, classroom observations and participation, and students' written assignments, allowing for triangulation which enhances validity and reliability in the study.

(1). Interviews

In this study, the seven case students were interviewed using semi-structured questions about their knowledge about World War II. Structured questions allow the researcher to compare the responses of students in order to identify overall patterns. The seven case study students were interviewed four times: prior to the unit of an instruction of World War II, after the typical classroom activities, after the textbook analysis, and after oral history activities. The length of each student's interview was approximately 15 minutes. A quiet location in the school, either their classroom or a conference room in the media center, was used for interviews so the conversations took place without being disturbed. I took written notes in addition to taping students' interviews. In this way, I could record my reactions to something the informants said, to signal the importance of what was being said, or to pace the interviews.

(2). Classroom observation and participation:

I observed the physical setting and environment, especially the every-day classroom setting, participants, activities and interactions, and conversations. During the first week prior to the unit of World War II, my stance was a "participant as observer" because I tried to establish rapport with the classroom teacher and her students and to gather inside information through various classroom activities, such as taking a quiz, drawing a picture, and listening to her lecture with other "classmates." However, my stance while collecting information as an observer was an "observer as participant" because my observer activities were known to the teacher and students and participation in the classroom activities was secondary to the role of information gatherer. As an observer, I tried to avoid my influence on students' perspectives and knowledge and on their teacher's instruction about the war.

When students asked me questions and perspectives about the war and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, I didn't respond to their questions. I just smiled at them or I said, "I don't know." While observing in the classroom, I took field notes and did not say anything unless the teacher asked me.

Field notes are commonly used in observations. During my study, I tried to take field notes about everything that I saw, heard, felt, and even touched. However, it was not an easy task. I initially took fields notes in English. However, I could not express everything because of my limited English vocabulary so that I started to take notes in my native language, Japanese. Taking notes in Japanese made me feel more comfortable as I observed.

(3). Document analysis:

For this study, I analyzed several examples of student work in the form of student-generated documents (KWL sheets, students' data sheets of textbook analysis, students' short essay about the atomic bombing, students' interview questions, transcripts of oral history interviews and copies of students' work and reflections). Students filled in KWL sheets before and after the unit on World War II. KWL sheets illustrated what students knew about World War II, what they wanted to learn about it, and what they learned about the historical event.

Data sheets of their textbook analysis illustrated what students discovered and how they perceived the textbook passages through comparative textbook analysis activities. Students completed a data sheet in which they classified similar and different treatment of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in U.S. and Japanese textbooks. These sheets illustrated what students discovered and how their perspectives expanded through comparative textbook analysis activities.

Students' interview questions for American and Japanese veterans were also used as data for analysis. The student-prepared questions were very important because their questions illustrated what students wanted to know about the war, particularly related to the two veterans' experiences during the war and their perceptions about the war. Students' transcripts of the oral history interviews were also important. These transcripts suggest how students thought on the two veterans' stories and what topics and stories they were most interested in. Individual comments were also analyzed.

Students' reflections and presentations were also important data sources in the study. Reflections and presentations gave students opportunities to write and talk about their discoveries through the unit of the study, and to express their perspectives about

World War II. It was also valuable for students to share their perspectives and interests with other classmates.

Data analysis

For my study, I used the constant comparison method of data analysis. Although the constant comparative method of data analysis was developed as the means of developing grounded theory, the method is widely used in all kinds of qualitative research studies, including case study. I began by analyzing each students' data (interviews, observation field notes, and writing assignments) and then investigating his or her data chronologically and topically. After I completed each student' data, I analyzed across students. For example, I analyzed each student's KWL sheet and interview and made generalization about what students knew at the beginning of the study about World War II. Finally, I began to see patterns of variables that transcended particular cases.

However, because of space limitations, I focused on the case of one student, Tom, for this paper. I analyzed his KWL sheet, his first interview (prior to the unit of World War II), his second interview (after the classroom activities about World War II), his data sheet of textbook comparative analysis activity, his third interview (after textbook analysis and classroom activities about the atomic bombing), his interview questions and oral history transcript, his fourth interview (after oral history activities), and then his reflections and presentation. Then I examined how his knowledge and perspective taking skills were changed, advanced, or disavowed through various activities.

5. Findings

Profile of Tom from Judy

> Tom is an average student in terms of academic ability, but an above average student in terms of enthusiasm and attitude. He is very positive in his approach in learning. Tom enjoys learning and exhibits a constant desire to learn more. He is capable of learning in a variety of ways. He is a very kind person who often helps classmates when they are having trouble with an activity or assignment. Tom is a very teachable student, the kind all like to have in a class. He can be counted on to participate, behave well, understand the lesson, and remember what he learned.

Findings of Tom's KWL and first interview

Prior to the unit of the instruction of World War II, Tom knew some basic information about World War II. His KWL data and first interview conducted prior to the unit indicated that he knew Germany, Japan, and the United States were involved in World

War II, Hitler persecuted the Jews, Hitler tried to take over Europe, Japan suddenly attacked Pearl Harbor, and two or three U.S. aircraft carriers patrolled when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. In addition, his KWL sheet indicated that he knew Hitler's anti-Semitism. (KWL sheet)

What do you know about World War II?

- I know that Hitler said that the Jewish stabbed them in the back and that was one reason why they lost W.W.I.
- The Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, but they did not know about our 3 carriers at sea.

(Interview)

I: Tom, tell me about World War II.

T: Well, I know that Hitler, um, told everyone in Germany that the Jews stabbed him in the back, and um, he wanted to take over Europe, and um, he got Japan to do that with him. And, um, I heard that they bombed World War, I MEAN Pearl Harbor, and, uh, that we had, I think, 2 or 3 air craft carriers out that, um, they didn't know about, and um, that's pretty much it, that's all I know.

He remembered a bit about World War II because he had learned about the war in 5th and 6th grade. Judy introduced World War I and World War II as a part of an introductory unit of geography of Europe and North America six months ago. His main information source about the war was his textbook and he did not talk about the war with his family.

I: What are sources of information about the war? How did you know that?

T: Um, well mainly, I got it from 5th and 6th grade, Ms. Williams taught me, and, that's how I got my source or information.

I: Did you read something about the war, like books or magazines?

T: Um, well, just in my textbook really. That's all, where I got my information.

I: Um. Your family told you about the war? Your parents or grandparents...

T: Un, no, not really. Not a lot.

Prior to the unit of World War II, he did not recall having learned about the atomic bombing.

I: Tell me about the atomic bombing.

T: Un, the bombing. Oh, uh, um... (long pause)

Findings of Tom's second interview

Tom learned about World War II by listening to Judy's lecture, taking notes during her lecture, and reading his textbook and handouts. He also watched Channel 1 programs. Judy taught the European Theater and then taught the Pacific Theater for one week.

Tom's second interview indicated the most recently gained information through, such as America freezing Japanese assets and the large scale of U.S. military force. However, in his second interview he focused only on the day's lesson. Judy used a concept map to teach about Japan during the war chronologically. He did not recall information from the map. He also did not mention anything about the European Theater that he had learned several days ago. He seemed not to connect the two.

I: Tell me about Word War II.

T: Um, well today we learned about Japan and how they tried to get stronger and take over other countries to look good into America and how America ended up freezing their money and they bombed Pearl Harbor and we had three aircraft carriers and it ended up turning into a hundred, something like 5 times the Japan's force, I think.

Although he initially seemed not to recognize the meaning of the atomic bombing and he misused the term, the atom bomb, in his interview, he learned that Hitler and the United States competed to create a new weapon.

I: Tell me about the atomic bombing.

T: Um, the atom bombing?

I: Atomic bombing. A-bomb.

T: Well, I know that when you drop it, it explodes and they used a lot of those. And, there was a bomb they were building, I think it was Hitler, and the U.S. was racing to build the atom bomb to destroy somebody around that area.

Judy taught that Midway was the turning point in the Pacific War. Tom selected the topic of Midway as the most interesting topic about the war. He likely remembered the class lecture, and he also recalled that he had learned about Midway outside of class, when he and his father watched an old movie about Midway together.

I: What is the most interesting topic about World War II?

T: Um, the most interesting topic, I think would be, um, I think the Midway was pretty cool and how we dropped in them and fought against Japan and all the planes going around the ship ... It's very cool.

I: Have you ever read books about Midway?

T: No. I've seen a movie on it though.

I: What kind of movie?

T: I forgot what it was called, it was pretty old, black and white, me and my dad saw it.

In his first interview, he responded that he had not talked about World War II with his family. His parents and grandparents still did not tell him about the war, but he brought home some interesting stories and information that he learned in his classroom.

I: Have you ever talked about World War II with your parents or grandfathers or grandparents?

T: Well, they never really told me anything but I'd bring home a lot of tidbits of information and tell them and stuff.

Findings of Tom's comparative textbook analysis data

After the first week of instruction about World War II, Tom and his classmates engaged in a textbook analysis to compare treatments of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in their U.S. and translated Japanese textbooks. His data sheet indicated he discovered similar and different treatments of the historical event in the two nations' textbooks. In the creation of the atomic bomb, he found that there was no information about who made the atomic bomb and about how the atomic bomb was tested in the either of the two textbooks.

In the treatment of America's motives and objectives in using the bomb, he found different treatments in the two textbooks. In the U.S. textbook, he found the description that the United States used the atomic bomb "to convince Japan to give up." In the Japanese textbook, he indicated that the United States dropped the atomic bomb because "we would come out stronger than the Soviet Union."

In the treatment of the Soviet role in dropping the atomic bombing, he stated that there was no information about the Soviet role in both countries' textbooks. In comparing the treatment of the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, he found that the U.S. textbook contained "very little information." He said that the Japanese textbook "tells it's the worst tragedy in man-kind."

Finally, in the treatment of the aftermath of the atomic bombing, he was surprised when he found in the Japanese textbook the number of persons who died from the bombing: 200,000 in Hiroshima, 140,000 in Nagasaki. However, he noticed that the number of dead was not found in the U.S. textbook.

Findings of Tom's short essay and third interview

Tom's explanation about World War II was still brief. However, he shared new ideas that half of the Jews in Europe were killed and that Pearl Harbor and Midway were important events in the Pacific Theater. He restated this perceptions of the importance of Pearl Harbor and Midway.

I: OK, Tom, tell me about World War II.

T: Well, um, Japan and Germany got into it. They thought they could take over the world and we ended up having to get in there and fight and many of, 1/2 of the Jews in Europe killed and, um, um, Japan bombed Pearl Harbor, which was one of the main things. And, Midway was a big thing. And, that's....

His information sources grew although his main information source was still Judy.

I: How did you know that [about the war]?

T: Ms. Williams. (laugh)

I: Did you read some books or watch TV...

T: Well, sometimes, my grandfather loves the History Channel and I'd watch a little bit on air, and textbooks and atlases and stuff, kinds, um, from information from.

Tom revealed that he was impressed by a story of a pilot who dropped the atomic bombs on Japan and committed suicide. He also learned that the radiation from those bombs was so great that its effects are still causing suffering to the victims of the bomb even today. He used terms of "vaporize" and "radiation" to explain about the atomic bombing.

I: Tell me about the atomic bombing.

T: Un, well, I know a lot more now. (laugh) A pilot went over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, is that it, and he bombed them and many people got vaporized and some are still suffering from radiation today and um, the pilot who ended up bombing, he didn't know and ended up committing suicide afterwards.

His short essay and interview indicated his perspective about the atomic bombing. He did not support the atomic bombing because many innocent people were killed and many people are still suffering from radiation. He used vocabulary such as "sick," "horrible," " a waste of lives," and "harsh" to talk about his perspective.

(short essay)

> I would not support the atomic bombing. I think it is a sick way to kill. Some people were just totally vaporized. Others are still suffering from it today. It causes many desises [*sic*] and is a horrible thing to do.

(interview)

> I: Some people support the atomic bombing. On the other hand, others do not support the atomic bombing. How do you think about [it]?
>
> T: Um, I think we should not support it because, I mean, it's just a waste of lives, I mean, all those innocent civilians got killed in that and they're still suffering from that today and so, I think that it's wrong and that it's a harsh way to kill some people.

He knew that the current nuclear weapons are more powerful than the Hiroshima-scaled atomic bombs. He described intensely scare feeling if he would be vaporized.

> I: If the same scale of the atomic bombs were dropped today, what would you think ?
>
> T: Un, I'd be pretty scared because you know, they're a lot larger today, you know the exploration would be a lot larger today, and so, it would be pretty scary, 'cause we'd get like vaporized.

Findings of Tom's interview questions for Japanese and American veterans

Tom prepared 17 interview questions for Mr. Martin and Mr. Yamada with Merry, one of the seven case study students, and another female student. They prepared questions they would like to ask particular to Mr. Yamada and Mr. Martin and questions they would like to ask both. Because they prepared questions through talking and sharing their knowledge and information about the war, questions that were specific to Tom can not be identified. However, these questions indicated that Tom's group wanted to know the veterans' feelings, perspectives, and thoughts about historical events during the war, particularly the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. As Tom's KWL sheet indicated that he would know a different story on World War II from the Japanese, they wanted to discover different or similar perspectives between the Japanese and American

veterans through oral history activities. Followings are questions that Tom and the other two students prepared.

(Questions for Mr. Yamada)

- What did it feel like going back to Japan after the surrender?
- What did Japan look like after the atomic bomb?
- Where did you fight?
- Did you know anyone that was killed in Heroshima [sic] or Nagasaki?
- Did the people in Japan know what was happening to the Jews?

(Questions for Mr. Martin)

- Did you feel guilty after you came back to America?
- Where [sic] you happy about the defeat of Japan?
- With what we know how would you still drop the A-bomb?

(Questions for both)

- How did you feel about the dropping of the atomic bombing?
- How did you feel whe [*sic*] Japan surrendered?
- Did you have to sign up or were you forced to go to the war?
- How do you feel about the war now?
- Where were you stationed?
- Did you get wounded in the war?
- How did you feel when you shot your first man?
- What do you think about Hitler?
- What do you think about Holocoast [*sic*]?

Findings of Tom's reflective writing

During the oral history activities, he sat at the very front in the class and took notes on the two veterans' responses while listening to stories of the veterans. His oral history transcript illustrated that he tried to take notes on all of veterans' responses and that he wrote down most of their responses in his transcript.

After the oral history interviews, Tom and his classmates reflected and wrote about their perceptions of the Japanese and American veterans and their responses. Judy prepared eight questions; however, Tom completed his reflections on only the first four questions because he did not have enough time to complete all in a class period.

1. Mr. Yamada said that he could not refuse to fight in the war, that he volunteered because it was duty. Mr. Martin said being in the war was something he had to do and that was all there was to do. How do you feel about their statements?

Tom and his group wanted to know whether they signed up or were forced to go to the war. After listening to their stories, Tom understood both veterans' situations that they felt they should fight in the war.

> I feel that they were both very ferm [*sic*] about their statements and their [sic] was no other explanation of not doing their job.

2. If the United States went to war would you feel like it was your duty to fight for your country? Why or why not?

Tom would fight for his country because he thought it was his duty. His willingness to fight supports the finding of the study by Krauss and Hashimoto (1996) that 69.1 % of American people are willing to fight for their country. The number is the highest among other countries: Japan (7.5%), Germany (16.3%), Britain (50.6%), and South Korea (60.1%) (Krauss & Hashimoto, 1996).

> I would think that it would be my duty because if I'm going to live here I am going to have to defend it.

3. How did it make you feel to hear Mr. Yamada say he was proud and happy to hear that Pearl Harbor had been dropped?

Tom was shocked to hear what Mr. Yamada thought about Pearl Harbor. His reflective writing indicated some confusion and unhappy feelings of Mr. Yamada's comment.

> I had a predictable shock. What I mean is that I knew he was going say what he said yet I was still shocked at what he said to us.

4. Mr. Martin said he thought Japan bombed Pearl Harbor because they were trying to take over the world with Hitler. Mr. Yamada said Japan bombed Pearl Harbor because of the U.S. embargoes of oil and steel. Who do you agree with and why?

Tom identified positively with Mr. Yamada because as a Japanese veteran and citizen, Mr. Yamada knew more about the reasons why Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. His reflection indicated that he has grasped a "new" perspective.

> I agree with Mr. Yamada because Mr. Martin wouldn't know for sure why they bombed us, but Mr. Yamada would because he lived in Japan.

Findings of Tom's fourth interview

His last interview indicated that he summarized World War II concisely with new information such as Germany taking over Poland and the death march. His explanation was still short; however, he could chronologically tell about both the European Theater and the Pacific Theater in World War II.

I: Tom, tell me about World War II.

T: Well, I know that the Germans fought it, got involved and took over Poland and the Japanese got involved and they bombed Pearl Harbor and that was a big thing and the death march was another really big thing for us and we ended up winning it against Germany and Japan. That's just the basic stuff.

His interview displayed that his main information sources were Judy and materials used in a classroom.

I: How did you get information about the war?

T: Ms. Williams and my textbook and stuff like that.

He indicated more information about the atomic bombing than he had told about. With the use of new word of hypocenter, he expressed how much the atomic bombs were powerful. He also said that people still suffer from cancer and other diseases because of the effects of radiation

I: Tell me about the atomic bombing.

T: Well, I know it was a lot more powerful than they intended and thought it would be and it vaporized people in the hypocenter and people are still suffering from it today, from radiation, like cancer and all the other different diseases and Hagasaki and no, Hiroshima, is that it? Hiroshima and Nagasaki got bombed and the pilot that bombed them took suicide later...

His interesting topic was changed from the Midway to the atomic bombing thorough learning more about the war. He became more interested in how the atomic bomb vaporized people and killed many people. These descriptions were not found in his social studies textbook. He heard them from Judy.

I: What is the most interesting thing during the unit of World War II?

T: Um, most interesting thing... I thought it was pretty interesting how the atomic bomb it just vaporized people and they don't really know how many people were killed. I just thought that was interesting to learn about.

Tom reasoned that the United States dropped the atomic bombs partially because of their understanding about the Japanese, "the samurai spirit." He reasoned view about the atomic bombing was different from the descriptions in the Japanese and American textbooks and from the two veterans' perspectives about the event. He remembered Judy's instruction about Japan during the war, during which he learned about Japanese unique geographical, historical, and cultural characteristics. She taught that Japan is comprised of many islands, Japan had maintained its isolation and disliked foreigners, Japan was forced to sign the trade agreement, Japanese people honored samurai, and samurai were honored to die and never surrendered. She also used a term, *harakiri*, that samurai chose to commit suicide rather than surrender.

I: Tell me why the United States dropped the atomic bombs.

T: Well, we thought that the Japanese would not surrender and we thought because of the background of the zamurai, yeah, samurai and that never give up was one of their things... fight to your death, and so we, I guess, we thought they're never gonna surrender. Japanese are gonna die one way so, why don't we just, save these lives, let's just go ahead and wipe out these and save the other half, so, I think that's why we bombed them.

Tom's interview showed that he learned first hand that the story of history is told from different perspectives and different experiences.

I: What did you learn from the stories told by American and Japanese veterans last week?

T: Un, I learned that a lot of their answers were similar and a lot of their answers were different and, um, the American dude, they were both like, um, (pause), descriptive about what they were saying, and un, they were very involved with their story and, um, there you go (laugh).

His interview indicated that he appreciated people who fought for their country. In addition, he appreciated Japanese soldiers' bravery.

I: What is Memorial Day?

T: Un, well, it's like your remember when the soldiers died and um, you remember all the facts like on Channel One that told about and gave you all quizzes on this stuff and Memorial Day, you just go over it, and remember the people who died in World War II.

I: What do you think about soldiers who fought for this country?

T: That they were brave and um, they were well trained, and um, they had to be pretty smart to be like a general or somebody and get into this area, so that is what I think about them.

I: How do you think about the Japanese soldiers...

T: I think they had to be a little bit more brave because they were a lot smaller than the U.S. and, um, fighting for a smaller country, they had to be really brave to do that.

6. Discussion

Tom's factual knowledge about World War II seemed to expand during the unit of study. He understood 1/2 of the Jews in Europe were killed by Hitler, Pearl Harbor and the Midway were important in the Pacific Theater, the American force was five times larger than the Japan's force, and the Death March was a memorable event. He talked about the facts of the war. However, it is interesting that he never used emotional terms to explain the war such as "deadly," "horrible," "sad," or "bloody." He seemed not to take an empathetic stance on the war.

His knowledge about the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was dramatically advanced. Prior to the unit, he had not known anything about the atomic bombing and he had seemed not to understand even the meaning of the term, "atomic bombing." However, his knowledge about the atomic bombing increased through Judy's lecture, comparative textbook analysis, and oral history activities. His interviews and other data indicated that he learned the following facts about the atomic bombing; the United States and Germany competed to create the atomic bomb; the United States dropped the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki; a pilot who bombed the atomic bombs committed suicide; many people were vaporized, killed or wounded; and many people are still suffering from radiation. He also found that the treatment of the atomic bombing in American and Japanese textbooks differed greatly, such as America's motives and objectives in using the bomb and the aftermath of the atomic bombing. As he learned more about the atomic bombing, he became less interested in the Battle of Midway and more interested in the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Tom's perspective about World War II and the atomic bombing advanced beyond the U.S. perspective he learned in his textbook. Regarding the historical event, he mentioned an American pilot and victims of the atomic bombing. The American pilot who bombed the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki committed suicide because he did not know what the bombs were and that the bombs would kill tens of thousands of people. Many innocent civilians were vaporized and killed and many people are still suffering from

radiation. He understood that the atomic bombs caused tragedies to not only Japanese people but also American people. Thus, he concluded that he did not support the atomic bombing based upon his knowledge about the event.

Tom indicated that he appreciated the people who fought in the war. Through the oral histories, he understood both the Japanese and American veterans' perceptions that they should fight for their country. Tom showed respect not only American veterans but also the Japanese veterans who fought for their each country because they were brave. Although he described intensely frightened feelings about the current powerful nuclear weapons, he believed that he would be willing to fight for his country if the United States would involve a war because he thought it was his duty.

His knowledge and perspective about the war and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were influenced by various teaching methods, such as the comparative textbook analysis and oral history activities. Comparative textbook analysis activities helped him to understand different perspectives because he found different descriptions about the atomic bombing in Japanese and American textbooks. The oral histories enhanced his multiple perspective because he learned first hand that the story of history was told from different perspectives and different experiences. In addition, oral history activities advanced his empathetic understanding because he could appreciate people who fought for their countries and respect people who were brave.

However, his interviews and writing data indicated that his knowledge and perspective were strongly influenced by Judy's instruction. For example, he described a reason why the United States dropped the atomic bombs was that the United States thought the Japanese, who had samurai backgrounds, would never surrender. His view was clearly influenced by Judy's lecture because she taught that the Japanese traditional spirit as one reason why the U.S. dropped the atomic bombs on Japan. This view was not found in either countries' textbooks and not shared by either veteran. Another example was the use of particular terms in his interviews about the atomic bombing. The terms "vaporize" and "radiation" were learned through Judy's lecture. Judy had cited a web site from Hiroshima City that included victims' stories. He always used both terms in his interviews after he learned about the atomic bombing. By listening to her lecture and stories, he could have been shocked that many people were vaporized by radiation. The shocking nature of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki probably contributed to his choice of the atomic bombing as a most memorable event by the end of the unit of study.

Thus, teachers play an important role to help students advance their knowledge and construct their perspectives. Teachers should encourage students to analyze and interpret different historical data and evaluating diverse historical perspectives. In order to achieve

this task, teachers first must go beyond textbooks with only single perspectives and then consider what should be taught in their lectures and what materials and methods should be used in classrooms. Alternative methods other than textbook-based teaching, such as comparative textbook analysis and oral history activities, can be introduced effectively.

References

Allen, M. G., and Stevens, R. L. (1998). Middle grades social studies: Teaching and learning for active and responsible citizenship. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Ashby, R., & Lee, P. (1987). Children's concepts of empathy and understanding in history. In C. Portal (Ed.), The history curriculum for teachers. p. 62-88. Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

Barton, K. C. (1996). Did the devil just run out of juice? Historical perspective-taking among elementary students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Boddington, T. (1980). Empathy and the teaching of history. Journal of Educational Studies, 28, 13-19.

Bohan, C. H., and Davis, O. L. Jr. (1998). Historical construction: How social studies student teachers' historical thinking is reflected in their writing of history. Theory and Research in Social Education, 26 (2), 173-197.

Brophy, J., VanSledright, B, and Bredin, N. (1994). What do entering fifth graders know about U.S. history? Journal of Social Studies Research, 16-17, 2-22.

Brophy, J., and VanSledright, B. (1997). Teaching and Learning History in Elementary Schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

CNN (1999). Stories of the century. http://www.cnn.com.

Cohen, P. (1995). Students as historians. ASCD Curriculum Update. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crocco, M. S. (1998). Putting the actors back on stage: Oral history in the secondary school classroom. Social Studies, 89 (1), 19-24.

Cronbach, L. J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 30, 116-127.

Dexter, L. A. (1970). Elite and specialized interviewing. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Dickinson, A. K., & Lee, P. J. (1984). Making sense of history. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee, & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), Learning history. p. 117-153. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Donmoyer, R. Generalibility and the single case-study, In E. W. Eisner and A. Peshkin (Eds.), Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate. New York: Teachers College.

Downey, M. T. (1995). Perspective taking and historical thinking: Doing history in a fifth-grade classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Downey, M. T., and Levstik, L. S. (1991). Teaching and learning history. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning. New York: Macmillan.

Eisenburg, N. and Fabes, R. A. (1990). Conceptualization, measurement, and relation to prosocial behavior. Motivation and Emotion, March, 131-149.

Erickson, F. Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Whittrock (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Old Tappan, NJ: Macmillan.

Feshbach, N. (1982). Empathy training and the regulation of aggression: Potentialities and limitations. Academic Psychology Bulletin, 4, 339-413.

Fleming, D. B. (1983). Nuclear War in High School History Textbooks. Phi Delta Kappan. 64 (3), 550-51.

Foster, S. J. (1999). Using historical empathy to excite studies about the study of history: Can you empathize with Neville Chamberlain? The Social Studies, 90, 18-24.

Foster, S. J., and Morris, J. W. (1994). Arsenal of Righteousness?-- Treatment of the Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima in English and U.S. History Textbooks. Curriculum, 15 (3), 163-172.

Foster, S. J., & Yeager, E. A. (1998). The role of empathy in the development of historical understanding. The International Journal of Social Education, 13 (1), 1-7.

Gagnon, P. (1988). Why study history? The Atlantic Monthly, 262 (5), 43-66.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greene, S. (1994). The problems of learning to think like a historian: Writing history in the culture of the classroom. Educational Psychologist, 29, 89-96.

Hamel, J. (1993). Case study method. Qualitative research methods. Vol. 32. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hashimoto, A. (1998). Japanese and German projects of moral recovery: Toward a new understanding of war memories in defeated nation. Paper presented at the Japan Forum sponsored by the Edwin O. Reischauer Institute of Japanese Studies, Harvard University.

Henry, S. M. (1986). Where Do We Stand on the A-Bomb? OAH Magazine of History, 10 (3), 51-2

Iannotti, R. (1985). Naturalistic and structured assessments of prosocial behavior in preschool children: The influence of empathy and perspective thinking. Developmental Psychology, 21, 46-55.

Jenkins, L. (1991). Re-thinking history. New York: Routledge.

Johnson, J. H. (1988). Improving social studies instruction: Advice to the generalist in a special world. Clearing House, 62 (4), 152-54.

Jorgensen, K. L. (1993). History workshop: Reconstructing the past with elementary students. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.

Kazemek, F. E. (1994). "Two Handful of Bones and Ash": Teaching Our Children about Hiroshima. Phi Delta Kappan, 75 (7), 531-34.

Klages, C. L. (1999). Secondary social studies' engagement with historical thinking and historical empathy as they use oral history interviews. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Texas at Austin.

Knight, P. (1980). Empathy: Concept, confusion, and consequences in a national curriculum. Oxford Review of Education, 15, 41-53.

Kobrin, D. (1996). Beyond the textbook: Teaching history using documents and primary sources. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Krauss, E. S., and Hashimoto, A. (1996). *Seigi no senso: America ni okeru dainiji sekai taisen no kioku.* Hosokenkyu to chosa, 46 (12), 34-47.

Lee, P., and Ashby, R. (in press). Empathy, perspective taking, and rational understanding. In O.L. Davis, Jr., E. Yeager, S. Foster (Eds.), Developing of historical empathy: Perspective taking in social studies (pp. 21-50). Lanham, MD: Rowman Littlefield.

Levstik, L. S. (1986). The Relationship between Historical Response and Narrative in a Sixth-Grade Classroom. Theory and Research in Social Education, 14 (1), 1-19.

Levstik, L. S. (1989). Coming to terms with history: Historical narrativity and the young reader. Theory into Practice, 20, 114-119.

Levstik, L. S. (1997). "Any history is someone's history": Listening to multiple voices from the past. Social Education, 61 (1). 48-51.

Levstik, L. S., and Barton, K. C. (1996). "They still use some of their past': historical salience in elementary children's chronological thinking. Curriculum Studies, 28 (5), 531-576.

Levstik, L. S., and Barton, K.C. (1997). Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools. Malwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lomas, T. (1990). Teaching and assessing historical understanding. London: The Historical Association.

Loewen, J. W. (1995). Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American History textbook got wrong. New York: The New Press.

Martinello, M. L., and Cook, G. E. (1994). Interdisciplinary inquiry in teaching and learning. New York: Macmillan.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

National History Standards Project. (1994). National standards for United States History: Exploring the American experience. Los Angeles: National Center for History in the Schools.

Newman, F. M. (1987). Higher order thinking in the teaching of social studies: Connection between theory and practice. Madison, WI: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Ogawa, M. (1998). A Comparative Study of the Treatment of Japanese Politics and Political Systems after World War II in Japanese and U.S. World History Textbooks. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Georgia.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Portal, C. (1987). Empathy as an objective for history teaching. In C. Portal (Ed.), The history curriculum for teachers. p. 89-99. Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

Rogers, C. (1975). Empathic: An unappreciated way of being. Counseling Psychology, 5, 2-10.

Schunke, G. E., and Krogh, S. L. (1985). Law-related education and the young child. The Social Studies, 76, 139-142.

Scott, K. P. (1991). Achieving social studies affective aims: Values, empathy, and moral development. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning. New York: Macmillan.

Selman, R. (1976). Social-cognitive understanding. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Reading moral education. Minneapolis: Winston Press.

Seixas, P. (1995). Conceptualizing the growth of historical understanding. In D. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), The handbook of psychology in education. Oxford: Blackwell.

Shemilt, D. (1984). Beauty and the philosopher: Empathy in history and classroom. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee, & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), Learning history. p. 39-84. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Siler, C. R. (1990). United States Textbooks: Cloned Mediocrity. International Journal of Social Studies, 4 (3), 10-31.

Sitton, T., Mehaffy, G. L. and Davis, O. L. Jr. (1983). Oral History: A Guide for

Teachers (and Others). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Smith, R. E., and Manly, S. A. (1994). Social studies learning activities packets. Social Studies, 85 (4), 160-164.

Stake, R. E. (1978). The case study method in social inquiry. Educational Researchers, 7, 5-8.

Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

VanSledright, B. A. (1995). I don't remember--The ideas are all jumbled in my head: 8th graders' reconstructions of colonial American history. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 10, 317-345.

vonEschenbach, J. F., and Ragsdale, C. (1989). The integration of elementary social studies and mathematics through experimental learning, Social Studies, 80 (6), 225-228.

Wade, R. C. (1993). Content analysis of social studies textbooks: A review of ten years research. Theory and Research in Social Education, 21 (3), 232-56.

Walker, R. The conduct of educational case studies: Ethics, theory and procedures. In W. B. Dockerell and D. Hamilton (Eds.), Rethinking educational research. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Wallen, N. E. and Frankel, J. R. (1991). Educational research: A guide to the process. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wellman, H. M. and Gelman, S. A. (1992). Cognitive development: Foundation theories of core domains. Annual Review of Psychology, 43, 337-375.

Wilson, S. (1979). Exploration of the usefulness of case study evaluations. Evaluation Quarterly, 3, 446-459.

Wineburg, S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. American Educational Research Journal, 28, 495-519.

Wineburg, S. (1994). The cognitive representation of historical texts. In G. Leinhardt, I. Beck, and C. Stainton (Eds.), Teaching and learning history. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Wineburg, S. (1999). Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts. Phi Delta Kappan, 80, 488-499.

Yeager, E. A., Foster, S. J., Maley, S. D., Anderson, T., & Morris III, J. W. (1997). Harry Truman and the atomic bomb: A high school classroom study in historical empathy. The Iowa Council for the Social Studies Journal, 10 (1), 53-61.

Yeager, E. A., Foster, S. J., Maley, S. D., Anderson, T., & Morris III, J. W. (1997). Why people in the past acted as they did: An exploratory study in historical empathy. The International Journal of Social Education, 13 (1), 8-24.